

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 stand rejected.

Claims 8 and 9 have been newly added. These claims are based on original claim 5. No new matter is entered.

Applicant's independent claims have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. For example claim 1 includes that the hold control means, when the predetermined time passes without detecting that the response signal is received by the detection means, generating the first request signal and transmitting the generated first request signal to the other party.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as not showing the feature "a response signal transmitting from a held EP after a predetermined time after a second request signal received, and a first signal transmitting from a hold EP" according to claims 1, 2, 6, and 7.

It is respectfully submitted that the features are fully submitted by the original drawings and specification, for example using the block diagrams Figs. 15-16, the system-configuration diagrams Figs. 10A-10B, the timing charts Figs. 12, 14, and the flow charts Figs. 17, 20.

Applicant's specification Fig. 15 discloses the block diagram of an EP, for example when an EP itself includes the features of the claimed invention. In addition the system-configuration diagram 10A, the timing chart Fig. 12 and the flowchart Fig. 17 correspond to the block diagram disclosed in Fig. 15. In this example embodiment the EP itself plays the role of the hold EP using the features of the claimed invention.

Applicant's specification Fig. 16 discloses the block diagram of an GK, for example when an GK includes the features of the claimed invention. The system-configuration diagram

10B, the timing chart Fig. 14, and the flowchart Fig. 20 correspond to the Fig. 16. In this example embodiment the GK functions similarly as an agency role on behalf of the hold EP using the features of the claimed invention.

In the exemplary block diagram of Figs. 15 and 16 the hold controller 1b(2b) has both detection means and hold control means as recited in claims 1, 2, 7.

The detailed description in the specification for Fig. 15 and Fig. 16 describing the features of hold controller 1b(2b) is recited on page 13 in lines 10-15, for example, referring to Fig. 15 and Fig. 16 as follows:

[The hold controller 1b(2b) performs call control for present invention]

In this description of the specification its indicated that the timer (not shown) in this function block is used to detect whether the response signal for the second request signal is detected within a predetermined time.

When a timeout is detected the call controller 1b(2b) outputs the first request signal (for example: when no response signal is detected within the predetermined time for the second request signal transmitted).

For at least the above recited explanation, it is respectfully submitted that the features of a "response signal transmitting from a held EP after a predetermined time after a second request signal received, and a first signal from a hold EP" according to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, is disclosed in at least Figs. 15, 16 and related description. Therefore the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claims 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure not enabling. More specifically, its indicated in the Office Action that "generating a

first request signal and transmitting the generated signal to another party only when there is no response signal received within a predetermined time after a second request signal transmitted" is critical to the practice of the invention but not included in the claims and therefore is not enabled by the disclosure.

Applicant's claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 are clarified to include the feature of "generating a first request signal and transmitting the generated signal to another party only when there is no response signal received within a predetermined time after a second request signal transmitted."

It is respectfully requested the rejection under 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art (AAPA). Regarding independent claims 1 and 6 the Office Action indicates that the AAPA discloses the limitation of these claims and relies upon the Prior Art Fig. 9B which shows a Remote-End Call Method and page 4 of the specification describing Prior Art Figs. 9A and 9B and teaching a detection means and hold control means of the claimed invention.

Fig. 9B discloses only the case that both the Hold EP and Held EP support the same Remote-End Call Method. As described on page 5, when the Hold EP and Held EP support different Remote-End call methods the call hold cannot be achieved.


The prior art fails to describe at least detecting whether the response signal is received within a predetermined time after the second request signal is transmitted; and when the predetermined time passes without detecting the response signal, generating the first request signal and transmitting the generated first request signal to the other party.

It is respectfully submitted the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.:
BSM:fd